

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-18 are pending in the application. Claim 3 has been amended. The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 7-9 and 17-18.

Claims 3 and 4 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Applicant has rewritten claim 3 in independent form to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 4 depends from claim 3. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3 and 4 are in condition for allowance.

II. The § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 5-6 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent No. JP409312935A ("Fujimoto") in view of Japanese Patent No. JP404200238A ("Okamoto").

Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 1 recites a power supply system that includes a power supply apparatus connected to a commercial power supply for supplying power to a main unit. The power supply system further includes a controller that executes an operation of power consumption control means for the main unit, which operation is started upon power consumption in the main unit exceeding a maximum output power of the power supply apparatus.

A potential advantage of such a power supply system is by starting an operation for power consumption control at the point when power consumption in the main unit exceeds a maximum

output power of the power supply apparatus, then power consumption of the power supply system can be controlled in a state while making full use of the performance of the power supply apparatus (specification page 5, lines 1-3).

A. Neither Fujimoto nor Okamoto Discloses a Controller That Executes an Operation of the Kind Recited In Claim 1 Upon Power Consumption in the Main Unit Exceeding a Maximum Output Power of a Power Supply Apparatus

Fujimoto discloses a power supply system including an AC generator that generates an AC current supplied to a load, and a battery. If the power consumption of the load is smaller than a specified value, a portion of the AC power from the AC generator is stored in the battery. If the power consumption of the load exceeds the specified value, power stored in the battery is supplied to the load (see Abstract).

Okamoto discloses power consumption control equipment including a detector that monitors power consumption of a communication system. When the power consumption of the whole communication system is detected to be higher than a preset first value, power control equipment within Okamoto's system having a low power consumption priority level are instructed to stop (see Abstract).

The Examiner recognizes that Fujimoto and Okamoto fail to disclose that the "specified value" (of Fujimoto) or the "preset first value" (of Okamoto) represents a maximum output power of a power supply. The Examiner, however, asserts that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention would have readily recognized that such maximum output power is implied in the teachings of both Fujimoto and Okamoto – that a typical threshold in the conventional system would have been a maximum allowable output that shall trigger a control signal when the threshold is exceeded. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As described in the specification at page 3, line 10 – page 4, line 25, conventional power supply systems are operated in a manner such that a maximum output power of a power supply is not exceeded, even for a moment – e.g., to prevent flickering of an LCD back light. To achieve such an operation, convention power supply systems typically perform a power management function to reduce power consumption of a main unit (e.g., a notebook PC) once the output power of a power supply reaches a pre-determined limit substantially below the maximum power specification of the power supply (e.g., 80% of the maximum power specification). As a result, the maximum output power of a power supply is not fully utilized in conventional power supply systems, which results in lower performance of the entire system.

Applicant respectfully submits that both Fujimoto and Okamoto describe such conventional power supply systems. That is, conventional power supply systems have a typical threshold – e.g., Fujimoto’s “specified value” or Okamoto’s “first preset value” – that is substantially below a maximum output power of a power supply. Thus, one of skill in the art at the time of the invention would not have considered Fujimoto’s “specified value” or Okamoto’s “first preset value” to be a maximum output power of a power supply.

Moreover, it is not inherent that Fujimoto’s “specified value” or Okamoto’s “first preset value” represents a maximum output power of a power supply. See MPEP 2163.07 - “To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence ‘must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.’” *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

B. The claim has limitations not taught by either reference

To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).

Both Fujimoto and Okamoto fail to disclose a controller that executes an operation of power consumption upon power consumption in a main unit exceeding a maximum output power of a power supply apparatus. Consequently, the combination of Fujimoto and Okamoto cannot render claim 1 obvious, and the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* showing of obviousness.

For at least these reasons, the applicant submits that claim 1, and the claims that depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance.

C. Other Independent Claims

Claims 10 and 12 incorporate limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claims 10 and 12 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over the combination of Fujimoto and Okamoto for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims 1 and 3-18 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

August 4, 2005



Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 493-4540